

CONNON BRIDGE LANDFILL SITE

COMMUNITY FORUM MEETING MINUTES

Meetings

Thursday 12 September 2019	2
Tuesday 10 December 2019	11
Thursday 20 February 2020	16

meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	12/09/2019
Location	Connon Bridge Landfill
Recorder	Natalie Chard
Chair	Mel Colton-Dyer

Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Mel Colton-Dyer	MCD	Independent Chair	
Patrick Daws	PD	SUEZ	General Manager
Graham Coplestone	GC	SUEZ	Operations Manager
Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Senior Site Manager
Natalie Chard	EE	SUEZ	Senior Community Liaison Manager
Annemarie Wilshaw	AW	SUEZ	Senior Planning Manager
Janet Haley	JH	Local resident	
Henry Haley	HH	Local resident	
John Emerson	JE	Local resident	
Doug Mills	DM	Local resident and St Pinnock Parish Council	
Jenny Mills	JM	Local Resident	

Jackie Ward	PM	Cornwall Council	Head of Waste
Dale Unsworth	CB	Cornwall Council	Integrated Waste Management Contract Team Leader
Matthew Sleeman	MS	Cornwall Council	Planning Officer
Howard Knapman	HK	St Pinnock Parish Council	
Carol Spear	CS	St Pinnock Parish Council	
Richard Pugh	RP	CLr for Trelawny Division.	
Mel Colton-Dyer	MCD	Independent Chair	

Ref	Note	Action
1.0	Welcome and apologies	
1.1	MCD welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced herself as the new independent chair. She asked that everyone switch off their mobile phones before the meeting started and requested that everyone introduced themselves.	
1.1	Apologies were received from Stewart Higgins, Paul Jordan, Christine Butler and Peter Marsh.	
1.2	<p>Actions</p> <p>1.2 NC confirmed that the report is now available on the website alongside minutes of meetings.</p> <p>1.3 NC confirmed that any suggested amendments to the code of conduct and terms of reference were added and that the documents handed out were the final agreed version. MCD asked that these documents be referred to again</p>	

	<p>under point 4.0 Format of meeting, as there were a couple of points she would like to suggest, which may improve the effectiveness of the meetings.</p> <p>2.1 PD informed the group that PR had now left SUEZ however, before leaving he had confirmed that this action had been carried out.</p> <p>2.3 NC informed the group that she had followed up the previous action with Braddock Primary School but there had been another change of head at the end of the summer term. She had contacted the new Head Teacher at the beginning of this new term and was awaiting a response.</p> <p>4.0 DU confirmed that he had sent an email the day after the previous meeting to the Operations Manager and that he was told the work had been completed.</p> <p>DM stated that the work had not been completed and that although other works had been carried out in the area, this continued to be a dangerous junction due to the overgrown grass verge.</p> <p>DU informed the group that he would be happy to send a follow up email to confirm when this work would be carried out.</p> <p>PD suggested that it would be worth asking PA for a bullet point summary of the works that have been carried out in the area since the last meeting.</p> <p>DU agreed to provide this.</p>	DU
2.0	SUEZ operational update	
2.1	<p>Bulky Waste Shredder operation</p> <p>GC reported that between March 2019 and May 2019, 395 tonnes of bulky waste per week had been received. 258 tonnes of this was processed using the shredder. During the period June to August this year, there was a slight decrease with 354 tonnes per week received. An average of 259 tonnes per week was being processed during this period.</p> <p>GC reported that the decrease in bulky waste had meant a decrease in vehicle movements, which was now on average around 74 movements per week.</p> <p>DM asked for clarity over the difference between tonnage received and tonnage processed.</p> <p>PD explained that some bulky waste received was removed during the pre-sort stage, as it could go direct to the CERC without being shredded. This resulted in a significant reduction in the amount of waste being shredded.</p> <p>DM suggested that this meant that over 140 tonnes per week arrived at Connon Bridge which didn't need to go through to the RTS resulting in at least 6 lorries per week.</p>	

	<p>PD explained that this was due to the actions of members of the public at HWRC's who put black bin bags into the bulky waste skips. He stated that SUEZ endeavour to divert as much as possible, with HWRC staff constantly trying to ensure that waste is put in the correct area however, this cannot always be monitored. PD added that if there was no black bag segregation on site, all residual material presented at the HWRCs would make its way through to the shredding operation at Connon Bridge. The black bag trial has therefore significantly reduced potential vehicle movements to the shredder.</p> <p>CS stated she was concerned about the number of lorries and asked PD where the waste was coming from.</p> <p>PD clarified that the bulky waste was coming to Connon Bridge from the whole of Cornwall.</p> <p>CS expressed disappointment that black bag waste from the whole of Cornwall was ending up at Connon Bridge.</p> <p>RP asked if the number of mattresses received per week continued to be high and what happened to the metal recovered from them, specifically does it still go to Henry Orchard.</p> <p>GC confirmed that per month SUEZ receive between 3,300 to 4,000 mattresses.</p> <p>PD then explained that once they are shredded and sent to the CERC, the metal is recovered by Ballast Phoenix who are able to retrieve it from the bottom ash. This is then sent off for recycling to one of two companies that Ballast Phoenix deal with in Cornwall, SIMS metals or Henry Orchard. Contractually however it is their entitlement to secure an offtake for the metal wherever they wish.</p>	
2.2	<p>RTS / HWRC</p> <p>PD informed the group that there wasn't anything particular to update, that operations were, business as usual and suggested that the HWRC be removed as a standing agenda point. If there were any changes it could always be added back on.</p> <p>JH informed the group that she had arrived at the HWRC at 9.30am to find the site closed because the staff were using heavy machinery. When the site is closed it means that there are queues out onto the road and she wanted to know why they were closed so soon after the opening time.</p> <p>PD explained that they have to close the site during certain operations like changing over bins to ensure the health and safety of the customers. He went on to explain that some bins are serviced by third parties like Henry Orchard</p>	

	<p>and happened, as and when they visited the site. He also explained that the Connon Bridge HWRC was actually a relatively small site and so it made it more difficult to safely manage the bins whilst the site was open. PD added that where possible bin exchanges were undertaken either side of public opening hours. There is however limited space on site as Connon Bridge is a relatively small HWRC. As capacity needs to be maintained, it is therefore inevitable that some bin exchanges need to be undertaken during opening hours as the bins become full although this practice is restricted where possible.</p> <p>GC added that where possible they have zoned areas to allow members of the public to continue to use the site.</p> <p>DM then added that the queues out onto the road are also caused by the queues of lorries waiting to get into the transfer shed. He suggested that SUEZ keep under review two streams of traffic to ensure cars can get into the HWRC easily.</p> <p>JH then went on to ask if the employees on site could be a little more helpful, she suggested if they helped more they could get cars through quicker and reduce queues.</p> <p>HH stated that he felt it would be nice if staff offered help rather than waiting to be asked.</p> <p>JM informed the group that she had always found the staff at the HWRC to be very helpful and had been pleased with the service she received.</p> <p>PD said that he would feed that back to the team but that if anyone had a complaint it would be helpful if they could complain straight away. It is important to try and capture detail of the circumstances i.e. what the issue was, time of day and description of member of staff etc. to assist with investigation into the matter.</p> <p>MCD suggested an action for everyone, that if there were any issues like queuing or customer service issues, that complaints were make immediately so that they could be dealt with effectively. Everyone was happy to agree to this action.</p> <p>RP asked if the new HWRC in Truro that had recently opened had a bulky waste facility.</p> <p>PD explained that the new HWRC was a state of the art, split level site with complete segregation of the members of the public and lorries but that waste was presented in the same way recyclables, residual (black bin bags) and bulky waste.</p>	<p>PD</p> <p>ALL</p>
--	--	----------------------

	<p>RP asked if the Truro site took commercial waste.</p> <p>PD explained that it was forbidden and that commercial customers were not allowed to use HWRCs. He then went on to explain that typically when a new HWRC opens initially there tends to be an increase in waste but that shortly after this there is usually a reduction of waste at other nearby HWRC's.</p> <p>RP then went on to ask for clarification as to whether the 240,000 tonnes of waste processed at the CERC was all black bin bag waste and was that the amount needed to keep it running.</p> <p>PD explained that the figure was made up predominately of household waste, the bulky shredded waste and some commercial waste. He went on to explain that the 240,000 tonnes was the amount of waste required for the plant to run at it's optimum level.</p> <p>MCD then suggested to RP that perhaps the questions were not in keeping with the current agenda point RTS/HWRC.</p> <p>CS then asked were the RTS lorries getting bigger.</p> <p>PD answered that they weren't any bigger and that they all complied with European legislation which requires their dimensions to be within a defined envelope.</p> <p>JH then asked how much of the electrical items discarded in the skips at the HWRC are recycled or reused.</p> <p>PD informed JH that he didn't have figures to hand but that small and large wee items are recycled.</p> <p>JH went on to say that these items appear just to be dumped into the skip and asked how they are recycled.</p> <p>PD explained the link with Cllr Giles and the St Blazey reuse, recycle shop and that Cannon Bridge is one of the sites that supplies the shop. This has PAT testing capabilities which enables it to sell on working electrical items however, any damaged items that can't be repaired and go off to be broken down into parts and the materials are then recycled.</p> <p>MCD suggested that a community repair café may be a great initiative to introduce into the area, as she recently struggled to find one close to her.</p>	<p>Parish Councillors Residents</p>
	<p>Landfill restoration</p>	

<p>2.3</p>	<p>IM informed the group that now the planning authority had approved the revised restoration scheme, phase 1 of the restoration works had commenced. The contractor for this work was Jones Brothers Ltd and who started work on 02 September. This phase will include the final capping, excavation of south west of lagoon 1 and regularising the landform around this area and is expected to take 6 weeks with the crushing and screening works starting next week. All work will be carried out during normal working hours.</p> <p>IM went on to explain that the remaining restorations works would take place in the spring and summer of 2020 when the weather would be better.</p> <p>DM asked where the crusher would be positioned on site.</p> <p>IM answered that it would be placed behind the stock pile.</p> <p>AW explained that the restoration plan was approved on the 16 August and that SUEZ were keen to move on with what could be done before the winter sets in. The priorities were the capping of waste and the works needed on the lagoon area as this would help to capture any surface water.</p> <p>MS added that the new planning permission would be regularly audited and a planning monitoring report would be produced.</p> <p>DM wished to highlight an observation he had made to paragraph 5 of the planning consent where wording had been slightly modified to include HWRC.</p> <p>AW explained that the planning authority review the applications and suggest changes to try and clarify certain points, the rewording was for this reason alone.</p> <p>MS explained that the reasoning around any amendments made can be viewed on line.</p> <p>MCD asked if MS would take an action to circulate the link to the group.</p> <p>DM referred to condition 11 – no working on site on Sundays. He insisted that this includes maintenance and asked why this was previously permitted.</p> <p>MS explained that any requests are reviewed on a case by case basis, for example taking into consideration if there might be concerns over noise issues.</p> <p>MCD suggested that if there were any essential works required that SUEZ should communicate this to the group.</p> <p>DM disagreed and noted that PR had explained that the shredder would probably need refacing again in another 13 months' time and DM believed that this shouldn't happen on a Sunday.</p> <p>PD challenged DM noting that on the occasion he was referring to, SUEZ had asked the planning authority for permission. The request was considered and</p>	<p>MS</p>
------------	--	-----------

	<p>granted and then SUEZ notified the group of the work that would be carried out. SUEZ would not do anything without consent.</p> <p>DM disagreed stating that it would not be an isolated incident and was likely to reoccur.</p> <p>Landfill</p> <p>IM informed the group that leachate levels in P4A3R continue to reduce but at a slower rate than anticipated. SUEZ had presented a draft paper to the EA which detailed the results of a pumping and recharge trial. The report concluded that the recharge to the above compliance level is due to a small amount of perched liquid entering the well which is not representative of the basal leachate. IM shared that the EA have requested the report which includes assessment of the performance of the leachate drainage blanket in phase 4. This is now being prepared but will conclude that compliance monitoring can be undertaken using pumped data, which would be compliant. It is expected that the EA will conclude that there is no benefit to switching pumps off especially for re-drilled wells such as P4A3R.</p>	
<p>3.0</p>	<p>EA update</p> <p>MS informed the group that he had not received any complaints about the site and that there was a monitoring visit due next week.</p> <p>PD suggested that since the EA no longer attended meetings and that there was rarely anything to report, that the EA Update should also now be removed as a point on the agenda.</p>	<p>MCD</p>
<p>4.0</p>	<p>Format of meetings</p> <p>MCD informed the group, that if anyone would like a question answered or issue raised at the next meeting, that they should email or telephone her and it would be added to the agenda. She asked NC to circulate her details. This she explained would allow time for everyone to feed in and raise issues in advance.</p> <p>PD suggested that any questions raised needed to be specific.</p> <p>MCD agreed and went on to explain that this type of format would allow SUEZ or Cornwall Council enough time to form a response.</p> <p>AW stated she thought that it was a great idea and suggested for example that the report MS referred to could have been circulated.</p> <p>Everyone agreed they were happy with the suggested changes.</p>	<p>NC/ALL</p> <p>NC</p>

	<p>MCD asked NC to make an amendment to the terms of reference stating that agenda items and reports from any party should be submitted at least 10 days before to the chair.</p> <p>MCD then went on to state that AOB should be short as concerns or questions should have been previously addressed on the agenda.</p> <p>JM referred to previous meetings where people had been on phones and that residents had been made to feel dismissed.</p> <p>MCD agreed with not having phones on and referred back to the start of the meetings where she had asked everyone to turn their phones off.</p>	
5.0	<p>AOB</p> <p>DM asked the total tonnage of waste that had been put into the Connon Bridge Landfill.</p> <p>PD stated that the question had been asked at a previous meeting and the answer from SH was in the minutes.</p> <p>JE asked what the blue markings outside the site on the road were for.</p> <p>IM informed him that they were water mains markings and that the site was due a replacement water meter.</p> <p>DM wished to thank SUEZ for their support on the printing of the recent 16 page Posthorn, which celebrated the 20th Anniversary of the Community Hall.</p>	
6.0	Date of next meeting:	
	Tuesday 10 December 2019	

meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	10/12/2019
Location	Connon Bridge Landfill
Recorder	Natalie Chard
Chair	Mel Colton-Dyer

Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Patrick Daws	PD	SUEZ	General Manager
Stuart Higgins	SH	SUEZ	Assistant Landfill Regional Manager
Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Senior Site Manager
Natalie Chard	EE	SUEZ	Senior Community Liaison Manager
Katherine Alexander	KA	SUEZ	Assistant Site Manager
Janet Haley	JH	Local resident	
Henry Haley	HH	Local resident	
John Emerson	JE	Local resident	
Doug Mills	DM	Local resident and St Pinnock Parish Council	
Jenny Mills	JM	Local Resident	
Jackie Ward	PM	Cornwall Council	Head of Waste

Dale Unsworth	CB	Cornwall Council	Integrated Waste Management Contract Team Leader
Matthew Sleeman	MS	Cornwall Council	Planning Officer
Carol Spear	CS	St Pinnock Parish Council	
Paul Jordan	PJ	Chairman of Braddock Parish Council	

Ref	Note	Action
1.0	Welcome and apologies	
1.1	MCD welcomed everyone and asked that everyone switch off their mobile phones before the meeting started.	
1.1	Apologies were received from Annemarie Wilshaw, Christine Butler and Peter Marsh. DM informed the group that Howard Knapman was unable to attend as he was convalescing at home after a recent heart attack.	
1.2	<p>Actions</p> <p>1.2 DU explained that Paul Allen was unable to provide a summary of the works previously carried out as requested but that Paul had suggested sharing his departmental contact details with the group so that if there are any further issues regarding highways they could be reported directly either via email on: handee@cormacltd.co.uk or via the Cornwall Council website.</p> <p>2.2 MCD asked if ALL had actioned reporting any complaints immediately. All of the members of the group stated that they had not had to action any complaints since the last meeting.</p> <p>2.3 MS had provided and circulated the link to all members of the Community Forum. MCD thanked him for the link and commented on how useful she had found it.</p>	

	<p>4.0 NC confirmed that she had circulated the new Chair's' contact details and that the terms of reference were now amended stating that any agenda items and reports now must be submitted at least ten days before the next meeting to the Chair.</p> <p>MCD followed on from this asking the group if all were happy to now officially adopt the terms of reference, all agreed. She then went through each page of the previous minutes asking members of the group to highlight any amendments they required.</p> <p>No amendments were suggested and the minutes for 12 September 2019 were agreed by the community forum group.</p>	
<p>2.0</p>	<p>SUEZ operational update</p>	
<p>2.1</p>	<p>Bulky Waste Shredder/ RTS operation</p> <p>PD informed the group that he would report on the operations for Bulky Waste and the RTS as unfortunately Graham Copplestone, the Operations Manager was unable to attend due to illness.</p> <p>PD reported that for the last three months, it was business as usual. In the quarter June to August SUEZ had accepted 354 tonnes of bulky waste per week for shredding but this had reduced to around 337 tonnes per week during the Quarter from September to November 2019. Of the Bulky material received 259 tpw had been processed through the shredding operation during the preceding Quarter (June to August 2019) but had risen marginally to 264 tpw during the Quarter (September to November 2019). The increase was attributed further efficiencies in the black bag separation procedures at the HWRCs and the pre-sort operation. Lorry movements remained fairly static at an average of c. 71 per week down from the preceding Quarter of 74 per week.</p> <p>PJ asked for confirmation of what was meant by movements. PD confirmed that this related to two movements for each lorry (entering and exiting the site).</p> <p>PD went on to explain that in November around 3,400 mattresses were processed and that although it sounds a significant amount, the figure correlates with the number of householders in Cornwall and the eight year frequency it is recommended that consumers change their mattress. However, PD did state that because of January sales it is anticipated that SUEZ will see a spike in this number in the early part of the new year.</p> <p>PD reported that SUEZ continues to encounter small fires which he suggested is down to the number of items thrown away that contain lithium ion batteries. He went on to explain that during the processing of waste, the batteries are agitated, and this can cause fires. He urged people to be responsible in disposing of these</p>	

	<p>items and referred to a joint fire awareness campaign SUEZ are involved in with Cornwall Council and Cornwall Fire Brigade. He also reiterated that the HWRC will recycle car and domestic batteries and have collection points on site.</p> <p>CS asked where residents can recycle batteries other than the HWRC.</p> <p>A discussion began around local battery recycling facilities MCD stated most supermarkets have collection points.</p> <p>PD then went on to explain that now that Truro HWRC is open, Connon Bridge is now also accepting bulky waste from that site. However general waste deposited at St Austell's HWRC is now going directly to the CERC and therefore the overall tonnage received at Connon Bridge remains on average the same.</p>	
2.2	<p>Landfill and restoration</p> <p>IM informed the group that well P4A3R continues to be monitored and is currently compliant when the pump is on. SUEZ are awaiting confirmation of the EA's position on monitoring P4A3R whilst the pump is on and this is expected sometime in December 2019.</p> <p>IM then went on to explain that Phase 1 of the restoration works started on 02 September and were carried out by the contractor Jones Brothers. He explained that the temporary cap has now been replaced with a permanent plastic cap but that the soils that were due to be placed on top were not completed due to the excessive rainfall, which made it unsafe to continue without risking damage to the cap. It has been agreed that this work will now be completed in the spring of next year with the remainder of the restoration work.</p> <p>SH added that vegetation clearance work will happen before then and is expected to be carried out in January and February 2020. He explained that the work is in line with the restoration programme and that, for example, conifers need to be removed to make room for the lagoon area. SH stated that no heavy plant will be used at this stage so there should be no disruption to near neighbours. He is hopeful that he will have a full detailed programme from the contractors that he will be able to share at the next meeting in March 2020.</p> <p>MCD stated she will ensure that this is added to the agenda for the next meeting.</p> <p>MS informed the group that he carried out monitoring on the landfill site on 18 November 2019 and is due to carry out another inspection on the 18 December. Since the last meeting he was pleased to report that there have not been any complaints about any operational activities on site.</p>	MCD
3.0	<p>AOB</p> <p>MCD asked the group for any AOB they wished to raise.</p>	



	<p>DM asked if SUEZ knew anything about the porta loo which has been left down the lane next to the site.</p> <p>KA advised that it belonged to CORMAC and that SUEZ have requested on several occasions for it to be removed.</p> <p>MCD then closed the meeting and wished everyone a very happy Christmas.</p>	
6.0	Date of next meeting:	
	Tuesday 10 March 2020	

meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	20/02/2020
Location	Connon Bridge Landfill
Recorder	Natalie Chard
Chair	Mel Colton-Dyer

Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Patrick Daws	PD	SUEZ	General Manager
Robert Williams	RW	SUEZ	Project Manager
Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Senior Site Manager
Natalie Chard	EE	SUEZ	Senior Community Liaison Manager
Katherine Alexander	KA	SUEZ	Assistant Site Manager
Niall Kelly	NK	SUEZ	Planning Manager
Janet Haley	JH	Local resident	
Henry Haley	HH	Local resident	
John Emerson	JE	Local resident	
Walter Gubbins	WG	Local Residents	
Mrs Gubbins	G	Local Resident	

Doug Mills	DM	Local resident and St Pinnock Parish Council	
Jenny Mills	JM	Local Resident	
Jackie Ward	JW	Cornwall Council	Head of Waste
Dale Unsworth	DU	Cornwall Council	Integrated Waste Management Contract Team Leader
Matthew Sleeman	MS	Cornwall Council	Planning Officer
Howard Knapman	HK	St Pinnock Parish Council	
Carol Spear	CS	St Pinnock Parish Council	
Paul Jordan	PJ	Chairman of Braddock Parish Council	
Graham Crabb	GC	St Pinnock Parish Council	
Richard Pugh	RP	CIlr for Trelawny Division.	

Ref	Note	Action
1.0	Welcome and apologies	
1.1	MCD welcomed everyone and asked that everyone switch off their mobile phones before the meeting started. She explained that the purpose of this meeting was to hear a presentation from Cornwall Council and SUEZ which would explain the changes proposed to the site in order to accommodate the new waste collection. She asked that during the presentations if anyone had	

	<p>a question please could they raise a hand and she will ensure that everyone takes their turn in asking questions.</p>	
1.1	<p>Apologies were received from Christine Butler.</p>	
2.0	<p>Cornwall Council and SUEZ presentation</p> <p>DU introduced himself to the group and explained that the presentation he was about to give would cover the new waste collection service, the new waste strategy and the alterations required to some of the facilities in order to accommodate the changes in the collection service.</p> <p>He explained that current recycle and compost rate was 38.1% of our household waste and that Cornwall was 234th out of 345 in the UK and therefore as a county we need to improve. He presented a slide which showed the percentage of residual, recycling and food waste currently in a black bin bag which supported the move for Cornwall Council to introduce food waste collection. Having recapped on the current weekly residual waste collection and fortnightly recycling collection DU then went on to present the new proposed collection regime with campaigns beginning in June 2021, the first bins and caddies delivered that Summer, and the new service beginning in Autumn/winter of 2021. He then explained that food waste would be collected weekly and taken to an anaerobic digestion facility.</p> <p>DM asked for assurance that the Connon Bridge site wouldn't be considered as a location to put an anaerobic digester on.</p> <p>JW stated that although it would be ideal to be able to manage all of Cornwall's waste within the county and be totally sustainable currently there were no plans or budget to be able to achieve this.</p> <p>WG asked why waste for example from down west was being transported to Devon when there were several anaerobic digestors within the county that they would drive past.</p> <p>PD explained to WG that although there are 3 in Cornwall they don't have the front end infrastructure to be able to accommodate the food waste. The companies were invited to tender but were not prepared to invest in the infrastructure and therefore a solution had to be found elsewhere.</p> <p>CS asked where in Devon would the food waste be sent.</p> <p>PD stated there were facilities at Holsworthy, Language in Plymouth and Somerset but that at the moment nothing was confirmed and that it depended on price.</p> <p>PJ asked for clarification that it was over 34% of food waste that was in black backs.</p> <p>DU confirmed that it was just over 35%.</p>	

	<p>PJ then asked if there was going to be a reduction of 35% of waste that was going to the CERC would there be enough waste to continue running efficiently.</p> <p>DU explained that of the 240,000 tonnes of waste processed every year at the CERC some comes from third party waste and therefore if there was less household waste the third party waste would increase.</p> <p>JH raised a concern that we are supposed to be reducing road miles and taking food waste to Devon would only increase it.</p> <p>WG asked whether Cornwall Council would get paid for the food waste they take to the anaerobic digester in Devon or whether Cornwall Council had to pay for it to be processed.</p> <p>DU explained it would be subject to the tendering exercise.</p> <p>PD added that the model would have to look at the cost associated with the food waste but also the benefit.</p> <p>DM asked what the increase in the number of lorries would be since food waste is being collected weekly.</p> <p>JW explained that currently over a two-week period residents have 3 trucks collecting residual waste and recyclables. Under the new proposed collection that would remain the same as the food waste one week will be collected by the same truck that is collecting the recyclables and would go to a materials recycling facility in Bodmin.</p> <p>JM stated that the truck shown on the presentation wouldn't get down some small lanes.</p> <p>JW clarified that there would be different size trucks and that the food collection truck was quite small.</p> <p>GC stated that there are quite a few people in his area that don't recycle.</p> <p>DU explained that residents would be issued wheelie bins or sea gull proof sacks for residual waste and only what is in these would be taken away, so it's hoped that this will encourage people to reduce waste and recycle more.</p>	
2.1	<p>SUEZ presentation</p> <p>RW and NK then presented the infrastructure changes required at Cannon Bridge in order to support the proposed collection changes.</p> <p>He explained that a new transfer station, specially designed for food waste would be built next to the existing station and showed the group a plan of the site and highlighted where it would be located.</p>	

DM asked why it had to be located at Connon Bridge. It made more sense to have it located somewhere like Saltash if it was then going to go onto Devon.

RW explained that it had to be on a site owned by Cornwall Council.

PD added that food waste is already coming to Connon Bridge but that it would just be separated out.

DM stated that separating it increased the chance of creating odour.

PD disagreed stating that by separating the food waste it gave more control over what happens to it and it is easier to manage odour.

RW added that the new food transfer station would have fast acting doors unlike the current transfer station shed which is left open.

PJ asked, if there are to be 5 new food waste transfer stations in Cornwall, are they all going to be on existing sites and specifically why was Connon chosen.

RW confirmed that the food waste bay would be introduced at Connon Bridge, Bodmin, St Erth, Launceston and Pool.

DM referred to the visit the liaison group made to the transfer station and suggested that since the shredder operation was at the far end of the building there was more than enough room to have a food waste bay in the centre of the existing transfer station.

PD confirmed that the transfer station was currently at full capacity as it is also used for the road sweepings, green waste and CERC waste which all have to be segregated.

DM suggested that the Connon Bridge site was going to end up like an industrial estate.

PD referred to the map and showed the landfill apron explaining that you cannot build on landfill and therefore there was limited space for any development other than digging into the bank area which would be very expensive and therefore not likely to be developed.

JM asked how close to the road would the new building be.

RW stated it would be more or less the same as the existing transfer station which was approximately 50 metres away.

	<p>WG suggested if a third of black bin bag waste was made up of food waste then a reduction in the black bin bag waste should mean that there is more than enough room in the transfer station to cope with the food waste.</p> <p>PD explained that the way the food waste is treated and because artics have to be able to manoeuvre in and out, there just was not enough room to add this operation to the existing transfer station shed.</p> <p>JW added that Cornwall Council would not be planning to build a new transfer station unless they had to as it would save the council the cost of the build.</p> <p>WB asked if there was an anticipation that there would be an odour and that is why the proposal included fast acting doors.</p> <p>RW stated that there would be two food bays, he went on to explain the process of rotating the use of the bays, that once one bay was full that it would be quickly emptied therefore reducing the risk of odour.</p> <p>JH asked what size the building was.</p> <p>MCD suggested that sizes could be discussed at a later date if the exact sizes were not available today, could they be shared perhaps at the planning consultation. She asked NK if that would be possible, and he agreed.</p> <p>DM noted that he felt the facilities were creeping towards the main road.</p> <p>PD highlighted that the facilities are well screened.</p> <p>PJ asked if consideration had been given to the effect the plans may have on the current restoration process.</p> <p>DM added that if bank was being dug out as part of proposed designs that would have an effect on the views from the footpath too.</p> <p>NK explained that only part of the bank was being taken away and that there would still be adequate screening.</p> <p>MCD suggested that the finer points of the proposals would be available during the public planning consultations and that members needed to remember that this extraordinary meeting is a very early sharing of information and therefore may not have all the details. She suggested that RW be allowed to carry on with the presentation and show some of the visuals he had on the proposals.</p>	<p>NK</p>
--	--	-----------

	<p>RW continued with the presentation and showed images of proposed designs.</p> <p>DM asked if this would be a stand-alone planning application and would a change in working hours be included in this.</p> <p>NK confirmed that existing hours would continue.</p> <p>As RW explained the designs he stated that food waste on occasions may be held for up to 48 hours.</p> <p>DM raised concerns about odour and at the same time JM added concerns about rats.</p> <p>RW reiterated that currently that same food waste is already arriving at the Connon Bridge site but is mixed in with other residual waste. Separating the waste will allow for better control.</p> <p>JM asked what would happen about lorry numbers.</p> <p>RW stated that lorries may increase however as the modelling of the new collection contract hadn't been completed, he couldn't confirm either way. However, he realised it was an important part of the consultation and would share the information as soon as it was available.</p> <p>DM suggested that this was an ideal opportunity to install a second weighbridge to stop the queuing that sometimes happens on the main road.</p> <p>RW stated he didn't disagree but that was something for Cornwall Council to decide.</p> <p>JW added that Cornwall Council is right at the beginning of the planning application process and that lots of work still needs to be carried out. However, if there were to be an increase in trucks it wouldn't be hundreds it would more likely be around half a dozen.</p> <p>PJ reiterated that the group would like to see the number of proposed vehicle movements as they feel they are already suffering from the increase of lorries due to the shredding process.</p> <p>JW informed the group that there were plenty of opportunities now and in further meetings and planning consultation events for them to voice their concerns.</p>	<p>RW</p>
--	--	-----------

CS wanted noted that she was concerned about the traffic through the village as there are already large trucks coming from East Cornwall and then down to St Dennis travelling through the village.

As the presentation came to an end DM asked how the food waste would be loaded onto the trucks.

RW explained that it would be a dedicated loading shovel kept inside the shed.

DM asked if it could puncture food waste bags.

RW stated yes it would be possible, but everything would be done inside the building with the doors shut.

JW added that residents might not use food liners and once in the collection truck they might get split then so it would make no difference.

PD added that SUEZ has a vast amount of experience in food waste management in residential areas and there have been no issues with odour there. The Environmental permit also requires SUEZ to demonstrate the controls we have in place.

WG asked if the food bays are cleaned.

RW stated they are cleared out regularly. They hold around 25 tonnes and are completely cleared out when the food waste leaves.

PJ asked if the trucks that take the food waste away have roll tops as it has been minuted in the past that not all contractors have fitted the roll top covers very well before leaving the site.

RW asked that if they have any evidence of this to please supply it so that it can be actioned.

PD then went on to explain that the criteria for food waste trucks is slightly different from the walking wall artics as they are not waterproof. The density of food waste is different so the new trucks would be waterproof and the waste would sit lower down in the truck therefore the issues of waste flying out are not the same.

JH added that actually with the weekly collection and the possibility of waste sitting in the transfer station for 48 hours, possibly 72 hours on bank holidays, food waste could end up being 9 days old and really smelly.

	<p>PD stated that it is no older than it is at the moment and there are no odour issues from the current transfer station.</p> <p>PJ asked if in the planning application that perhaps a section 106 could be introduced to ensure road safety and safe crossing places.</p> <p>NK informed the group that Cornwall Council will look at road safety as part of the application process.</p> <p>DM then added that if St Dennis and Nanpean received £100K per year for the inconvenience of living next to the CERC perhaps because of the increase in vehicles and potential for odour that there should be some benefit to the local community. He then went on to inform the group that whilst the community was grateful for the defibrillator which was paid for by SUEZ ,a request for a second one was turned down and the cost of printing the parish newsletter will stop once the landfill site is fully restored.</p> <p>RW then informed the group that there would be consultation events in May 2020 with a submission of the application on 26 May 2020.</p> <p>DM asked what the cost of the changes would be.</p> <p>RW declined to answer stating that tenders had not been submitted yet.</p> <p>RP referred to a briefing given on the food waste collection at Cornwall County Hall and stated they were told that food waste would be stored for up to 24 hours not 48 or possibly 72 hours he then asked how much solid waste like bones could be taken.</p> <p>PD explained that at the front end of the process was a macerator which turns the solid waste into pulp and state that facilities like these were designed to cope with contamination.</p> <p>RW added that any comments anyone would like to leave about the proposed plans could be left on the comment sheets set out at the back of the room.</p> <p>PD asked if NC could circulate them via email to the group so that they could be emailed or posted back.</p>	<p>NC</p>
	<p>Close of meeting</p> <p>MCD thanked everyone for attending the extraordinary meeting and reminded everyone that if they wanted anything adding to the next Community Liaison meeting agenda, that they should email her directly.</p>	



	DM stated he didn't have MCD's email address, NC stated it had been sent out previously but that she would send it out again with the comment forms.	NC
--	--	----